



City of Tempe

MINUTES FOR BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
SPECIAL MEETING

5:30pm-6:10pm June 27, 2001
DS Admin. Conference Room

REPRESENTATIVES ATTENDING:

William Cleaveland	Cheri Edington
Robert Hunt	Martin Pasqualetti
Marc Jung	Darrin Sender
Tracy Dennis	

STAFF ATTENDING:

Roger Millar, OTAK	Arlene Palisoc
Fred Brittingham	

1. INTRODUCTION

Roger Millar presented a slide presentation to the Board of Adjustment, which highlighted the progress and findings during Phase I of the Regulatory Document Rewrite. The presentation concluded with the "next steps" which asks the Board of Adjustment members to review the Audit Report and Toolbox, make comments and/or suggestions, and return the comments back to Development Services by June 29, 2001.

2. KEY ISSUES BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

1. Sample of People

Questions were raised about whom and how the sample of people interviewed were chosen and if there was representation from all parts of Tempe. Board member Hunt noted there seems to be a polarization to north and south Tempe while the center of Tempe seems to be in a "vacuum". The central area has suffered and is in a decline and Hunt questioned if there was any representation. Staff informed the Board members that the Citizens Advisory Committee and Staff Advisory Committee were interviewed, questionnaires/web questionnaires about were available to the public for input, and four focus groups meetings of different disciplines, three hour each were conducted earlier by Otak. The twelve people chosen to the Neighborhood Focus group represented all areas of Tempe in order to get a good sampling of the neighbors concerns. The Board suggested creating a map showing the areas the focus group members represent in Tempe.

2. Mixed Use

The Board questioned how and where can mixed use be encouraged. Suggestions included identifying specific areas determined by the community. Mixed use designations also depend on whom you are talking to and where they feel the best location is in Tempe.

3. Input from the Board of Adjustment

Specific and/or general types of input are encouraged of the Board when responding to the Audit Report and Toolbox.

4. Expanding Administrative options:

Some Board members thought expanding administration's options was a good idea, especially if it is a type of project easily handled by Staff. Such an option can encourage legal construction on existing homes if process was easier which improves the value of the neighborhood.

5. Ways to improve home owner's property without turning it into a rental property

Staff noted they had no answers at this time, but did note that the code cannot be written as a "silver bullet" to the situation. If such a program to improve home gets established, the code must then be written to make sure it works in conjunction with all other codes and regulations and not be a road block to the applicant.

6. Mission, Goals, and Objective statement

Board member Pasqualetti asked how the Mission statement was derived as presented in the June 11, 2001 Audit Report. Staff indicated the Mission statement is a working document, which can still be changed. As for the history, the Mission statement was first created by the planners at Otak and then distributed to the Staff Advisory Committee for input, then to the Citizen Advisory Committee for input, and finally to P&Z for input. All comments were later incorporated into the Mission, Goals, and Objective statement as presented in the Audit Report. The Board indicated the statement should be worded to implement the General Plan and encourage creative development.

7. Citizens going through process

Board members pointed out the need for a process that facilitates ease to citizens. A difficult/complex process can scare public. Staff referred to the goals in the Mission, Goals, and Objectives statement wanting to make things easier.

8. Meeting adjourned 6:10 pm.